DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 171 RC 016 782

AUTHOR Kalantzis, Mary; Cope, Bill
TITLE Pluralism and Equitability: Multicultural Curriculum Strategies for Schools. NACCME Commissioned Research Paper No. 3.
INSTITUTION National Advisory and Co-ordinating Committee on Multicultural Education, Woden (Australia).
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 45p.; For related document, see ED 286 259.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Pluralism; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Principles; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); *Equal Education; Foreign Countries; *Multicultural Education; *Second Language Learning; Social Bias; Social Cognition
IDENTIFIERS *Australia

ABSTRACT

This paper compares pluralistic and equitable approaches to sociocultural and language teaching in Australian schools. The pluralistic view of multiculturalism overemphasizes ethnic differences with the hope that appreciation and tolerance will follow. In fact, fostering feelings of difference may increase racism and cultural chauvinism. This emphasis neglects arguments about what culture is for, and the concomitant realization that everyone has culture. Equitable multiculturalism celebrates diversity, but also aims to provide students with tools of social literacy for cultural analysis and mainstream participation. Pluralism moralistically posits linguistic equality and simply aims to reproduce "community languages" as they are spoken. While not advocating the abandonment of community language projects, the equitable approach aims for language learning that provides the broadest cognitive and communicative usefulness. All language teaching should have an intellectual seriousness equal to that of traditional "foreign language" teaching. Equitable English teaching involves not only competence to survival stages, but also English for general use; it takes into account the break in language development that occurs as non-English-speaking children enter school. Multiculturalism should pervade mainstream curriculum areas. Achieving this end requires uniting the best of traditional and progressive curricula: a core curriculum that prepares students for equal access to society, with an inquiry methodology that develops general cognitive, conceptual, and linguistic skills and promotes understanding of self, family, and society. 24 references. (SV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300171

MAY 1988
RECEIVED
ERIC CRESS

NACCME

National Advisory and Co-ordinating Committee on Multicultural Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ANNY STUER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

NACCME COMMISSIONED RESEARCH PAPER NO 3

Pluralism and Equitability: Multicultural Curriculum Strategies for Schools

by

Mary Kalantzis and Bill Cope

RC 016782

NACCME COMMISSIONED RESEARCH PAPER NO. 3

PLURALISM AND EQUITABILITY: MULTICULTURAL CURRICULUM STRATEGIES FOR SCHOOLS.

BY

MARY KALANTZIS AND BILL COPE

© Commonwealth of Australia

Copies may be made of this material without reference to NACCME on behalf of the Commonwealth provided that:

(i) they are used for educational purposes

(ii) the source is acknowledged

(iii) they are not to be sold.

NACCME

NATIONAL ADVISORY AND CO-ORDINATING
COMMITTEE ON MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

PREFACE

The National Advisory and Co-ordinating Committee on Multicultural Education (NACCME) was established by the Minister for Education (and Youth Affairs), Senator Susan Ryan, on 27 March 1984, following from the Government's acceptance of Recommendation 29 of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs Evaluation of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants (May 1985).

NACCME's Terms of Reference are to:

(i) advise the Minister for Education on matters relating to multicultural education;

(ii) co-ordinate, monitor and review multicultural programs and activities;

(iii) determine an appropriate procedure for information exchange and put that procedure into practice.

NACCME's main function is to provide advice on the needs of multicultural education across a broad spectrum, from pre-school to higher education and information education mechanisms such as the media. The Commonwealth Department of Education provides the Secretariat for the Committee.

At its inaugural meeting, Senator Ryan suggested that the Committee develop a major policy document on multicultural education, and this was taken up as a major task for NACCME over the past three years. On 26 May 1987 NACCME's policy document Education In and For a Multicultural Society: Issues and Strategies for Policy Making was officially launched.

In developing this major policy document NACCME sought input from outside experts by commissioning a number of background research papers.

NACCME is pleased to now release a series of seven papers comprising eight commissioned research papers which had direct input into our own document.

We hope that these papers will add to the pool of information available on, and constructive discussion of, issues in multicultural education.

The views expressed in these papers are not necessarily those of NACCME itself.

This paper entitled Pluralism and Equitability: Multicultural Curriculum Strategies in Schools is by Mary Kalantzis and Bill Cope, who are Research Fellows, at the Centre for Multicultural Studies, University of Wollongong.

This is the third paper in the NACCME Commissioned Research Papers Series.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

NACCME asked the consultants to prepare a paper of 3,000 - 5,000 words on the development of curriculum strategies for schools in multicultural education which suggests strategies that

- have a sound basis in learning theory and curriculum process;
- have a coherent underlying rationale;
- are related to the realities of the children's lives in and out of school, including the working lives of their parents; and
- incorporate concerns about equity

This paper was completed for NACCME in early 1986.

PLURALISM AND EQUITABILITY: MULTICULTURAL CURRICULUM STRATEGIES FOR SCHOOLS

A Position Paper for the National Advisory and Co-ordinating Committee on Multicultural Education.

Mary Kalantzis

Bill Cope

Multiculturalism, as a relatively new social movement in Australia, not only involves contested meanings and practices, but has also frequently brought with it a relative lack of clarity of rationale and single-mindedness in process. The aim of this position paper is to clarify alternative meanings and practices by summarising its main alternative tendencies in education.

In broadest outline, we distinguish two forms of multiculturalism which we have termed, for the purposes of clear argument, 'pluralistic' and 'equitable'. These are not words practitioners necessarily use to describe their own work. Nor would they often regard the two practices as opposed to each other. In fact, they are more to be viewed as tendencies along a continuum of rationales and practices. Often, the two sit somewhat contradictorily together.

This paper takes a definite stance for equitable rather than pluralistic multiculturalism whilst appreciating a great deal of validity in many of the propositions of pluralistic multiculturalism and respecting its historic contribution in the general development of multiculturalism in education in Australia. In arguing for an equitable multiculturalism, we are really suggesting that educators have a duty to build upon the positive achievements of pluralistic multiculturalism in order to make multiculturalism a stronger and more demonstrably effective and efficient process in schools. It is time to move on. Indeed we would like to suggest there are positive indications that we are moving on. Nor in arguing against pluralistic multiculturalism are we denying any of the sociological and educational realities and challenges of cultural plurality in Australia. Indeed, an equitable multiculturalism would aim optimally to service and draw benefit from this reality.

As a position paper towards policy formulation, the following presentation adopts a particular style. It is not a literature review or an overview of policies. Nor is it a summary of research findings. Rather, it seeks to clarify distinct alternatives often mixed and confused in the rough and tumble of theory, research and practice in a new social and educational movement. All references in this text are to our own theoretical work. In further reference to these there are to be found arguments elaborated upon in more detail, empirical research findings and extensive references to the literature and government policies in the field. Furthermore, the arguments presented below are, we feel, supported and vindicated in our practical experiences in schools

in the Social Literacy social education curriculum materials project.

The paper that follows is divided into three major sections: on **Rationales, Processes** and **Outcomes** of pluralistic and equitable multicultural curriculum strategies. Within each of these sections we examine both policies and practices which could broadly be called 'socio-cultural' and 'the language question'.

Following is a diagrammatic abstract of the paper.

Pluralistic Multiculturalism	**Equitable Multiculturalism**
RATIONALES: SOCIO-CULTURAL	**RATIONALES:** SOCIO-CULTURAL
Culture is variety, traditionalism and the preserve of the 'ethnics'.	Cultural variety in Australia needs to be understood both in the context of elements common to us all as humans, and the structures and core culture of western industrialism in contemporary Australia.
Race exists in reality and race relations is a legitimate area of endeavour. Racism is a difficult term often excessively moralistic in tone. Anti-racist strategies that bring the issue into the open are to be avoided in preference to more pleasant forms of positive cultural appreciation.	'Race' doesn't exist, but it is necessary to tackle systematically the ideology of racism, carefully defined as a social reality. Superficial strategies of cultural appreciation have little effect on racist practices.
Ethnicity is associated with immigrants of non-English speaking background and with visible cultural difference.	We are all ethnic and our ethnicity often takes forms that don't appear as visible difference or as traditionalism.
Celebration of ethnic cultural variety is a way of fostering personal integrity and social cohesion.	Empowerment through skills of social literacy for western industrialism (abstract social conceptualisation, skills for active participation); knowledge and awareness of one's becoming as a social being; and the ability to choose and participate in the making of diversity.

LANGUAGE	LANGUAGE
All languages in their various everyday usages are equally valid 'community' languages.	English is the language of social enablement in Australia and, as such, more than just a 'community' language. Particular forms of English portend the possibility of social participation and equitable access to education.
Languages need to be maintained to prevent the intrinsic loss of their non-preservation, to maintain communication between generations, to maintain cultural variety and to build self-esteem.	Simply to preserve 'community' forms is in some instances simultaneously to reproduce socio-linguistic inequity. Language learning needs to be more than a token to enhance self-esteem. There need not be a division between traditional 'foreign' language teaching and 'community' language teaching in terms of intellectual seriousness and educational ambitiousness.
Students should learn other languages to learn culture through language and to become more sensitive to other cultures.	Language learning can only be a minor part of a wider more direct strategy of combatting racism and for harmonious social interaction.
PROCESSES: SOCIO-CULTURAL	**PROCESSES:** SOCIO-CULTURAL
Socio-cultural education should be locally specific and thus relevant and diversified.	Whilst being based upon locally-relevant inquiry, there are certain core issues to multiculturalism which should be addressed by all students equally; What is culture? How does socialisation occur? How do we all acquire culture? What is racism?
There can only be an advocation of curriculum processes from which schools then develop their own curricula.	Equal emphasis needs to be placed on open processes (to ensure relevance) and common core content (e.g. directives to multiculturalism). Co-operation is needed between teachers, consultants and academics in order to produce a variety of substantial models of curriculum practice in new fields of inquiry such as multiculturalism. This needs to be supported by centres of materials production and professional development which systematically and structurally link to school practice.
Tolerance will be produced by osmosis thorough exposure to cultural differences via ethnic specific studies and activities.	Racism needs to be tackled through an investigation of what culture is for all humans and through direct strategies analysing its ineffectiveness as an explanation of social process. Rather than being an addition to curricula,

	the issues and tasks of multiculturalism should be part of mainstream areas and whole school arrangements.
Social and pedagogical change via reliance on consultants, resource centres and preaching the ethos of multiculturalism, supported by a funding principle of seeding.	Program development involving both materials production and teacher training/inservice aimed at whole school development. This would need to be supported by tied, specialist program funding with mainstream goals. Promoting social and pedagogical change by educating the educators whilst responding to their immediate needs in the classroom.
LANGUAGE	LANGUAGE
Consistent with the achievements of the previous rationales, all students of non-English speaking background would require at least minimal exposure to their native language at school.	Whilst it might be desirable that all students study their native languages as full subjects, the possibility of learning any other language can achieve some fundamental cognitive-linguistic goals.
Minimal representation of languages at least betokens respect.	Self-respect emanates more from what schools do generally than from gestures to difference. Sustained programs are needed to prevent the disruption of lines of cognitive development on entry to school for students of non-English speaking background. And language teaching needs to be interventionary, opening up socio-linguistic range rather than simply reproducing 'community' forms.
Learning another language, even minimally, contributes to cultural sensitisation.	The knowledge of the mechanics of another language does not provide understanding of the lived experience of people from different cultures. All languages,'community' and 'foreign', should be taught to the same degree of ultimate intellectual seriousness to contribute to equitability.
Different curricula are needed for different English language needs.	Different pedagogies (recognising plurality for adequate servicing) are needed, but with singularity of end; those essential forms of English language and cognition that allow access to higher education, social literacy and social participation.

Diversified needs-based rationale for methodological decisions. Each school and language constructs its own agenda.	Outcomes need to be linked to needs and methods. The association between language and social and academic success requires evaluation procedures to be developed that have methodology and content as their goal rather than streaming.
OUTCOMES: SOCIO-CULTURAL	**OUTCOMES:** SOCIO-CULTURAL
A trivialised, stereotypical traditionalist concept of culture and intellectual and institutional marginalisation of the issues.	Social literacy; an understanding of the nature of culture, cultural variation in the context of human commonality; and racism as inadequate social explanation. The development of skills for understanding and active participation in industrial society whilst appreciating cultural variety.
Cultural conservation.	Cultural choice
Fragmentary and add-on type inputs as a result of short term, limited funding on the seeding principle.	Sustained, centralised support for long term, decentralised, targetted program development to transform mainstream areas consistent with new social imperatives
LANGUAGE .	LANGUAGE
Reproduction of linguistic life histories, which can entail reproduction of relations of socio-linguistic inequity.	Variant pedagogies with singularity of end: forms of language with the broadest and most potent cognitive and communicative usefulness. Exposure to varieties of discourse. Language is a tool of effective communication and participation, not an artefact or just a symbol of identity.
Division of 'community' and 'foreign' language teaching.	No division in terms of educational status, seriousness and fundamental ends between different types of language teaching.
Emphasis on difference tending to mask role of the school in unequal outcomes.	Performance, proficiency and academic achievement evaluated in order to contribute to students' needs in a more informed way.

1. Rationales

1.1 The Pluralist Rationale for Socio-Cultural Curriculum Strategies

1.2 A Rationale for Socio-Cultural Curriculum Strategies in an Equitable Multiculturalism.

1.3 Pluralistic Rationales for the Language Ouestion

1.4 Equitable Rationales for the Language Question

1. Rationales

1.1 The Pluralistic Rationale for Socio-cultural Curriculum Strategies

Different types of rationale for multiculturalism are most clearly distinguishable by the meanings they give to their keywords. We will examine here the meanings given to 'culture', 'race', 'racism' and 'ethnicity'.

Most frequently, multiculturalism is described and prescribed without any definition of culture which we can be 'multi' about. Sometimes it is simply stated that 'culture' is a term whose meanings are disputed. Sometimes the content of culture can only be gleaned from the context in which it is used. It is often hard to get away from the connotation that, for pluralistic multiculturalism, culture is music, dance, clothes, food and drink. Somewhat contradictorily, the following series of associations often emerges. Culture roughly equates with traditionalism. National dress and Irish ditties seem more cultural for the purposes of multi-cultural-ism than Wollies and 'Like a Virgin'. It involves subjective self expression more than it does social structures. Culture is, by and large, to be found more on one side of the divide between the week and the weekend, work and leisure, public and private life, wider social relations and relations within the family or domestic arena. A certain festive colour is fine, but reproducing Albanian communism or Turkish peasantry is out of the question. This is neither to deny festive niceness nor to advocate the importation of dramatically different social structures (which would be a necessary consequence of serious structural pluralism) but to point to some il-defined commonsensical limits to the culture of multiculturalism. Pluralistic multiculturalism keeps itself safely within these limits, concerning itself, crudely speaking, with the culture that can be happily multi in Australia. (1980:1-19; 1981:89-99)

A number of problems arise with this working conception of culture. First, it frequently means that culture is trivialised to things which are visible and different. This involves not just viewing culture as those things that are superficial and nice, but an overwhelming emphasis on differences that we have to appreciate and tolerate. This emphasis is to the relative neglect of arguments about what culture is for (which means we all have culture and share many fundamental characteristics as humans) and the culture of western

industrialism in Australia which unites (through the rigours of everyday survival) and empowers (if one is able to go beyond a minimal ability to participate).

Second, there is a hidden agenda of cultural conservatism. There is an assumption that cultural preservation is a good thing in itself, as if traditions should not be lost for posterity's sake. On-going cultural pluralism seems to mean that traditions will necessarily and positively need to be maintained. This is an active policy of cultural conservatism which might suit some 'community leaders' but doesn't always, for all aspects of 'culture', seem such an obvious or desirable choice. Peer cultures and the structural possibility of greater independence for girls and women, for example, often militate against cultural retention. It is not always clearly the case that those ascribed membership of a cultural grouping should want to reproduce all elements of their ancestral culture. This is not to imply that cultural conservatism is always or necessarily undesirable. But we must allow an openness to cultural dynamism and the possibility of cultural influence, even when that might be to reduce plurality. Moreover, cultural conservatism often lends itself to an implicit assumption that culture is eternal and ultimately a matter of genealogy or even genetics.

Third, overly simplistic advocacy of cultural maintenance can involve two forms of racism. On the one hand, there is a certain racism to the pluralistic multiculturalist's advocacy that you keep your culture. Live and let live. Your cultural practices are fine for you, but I wouldn't chose some of them for myself (as evidenced in my own practice). This is a racism of patronising non-debate and distancing 'other' cultures. On the other hand, there is often a racism to preserving one's own cultural identity. This can vary from relatively mild forms of cultural chauvinism; to entreaties to marry within the group for the sake of family and tradition; to defining group identity in part through long-standing nationalistic or chauvinistic rivalries.

'Racism' is a central object of interest for multiculturalism, but, like 'culture', it is frequently not clearly defined, or il-defined in context and usage. It is often assumed that 'race' is a valid concept and that there really is such a thing as 'race' and real 'race relations.' On the contrary, there are convincing arguments that the concept of 'race' was a very problematic product of nineteenth century social science at a time when

phenotypical differences between human beings seemed to correspond with imperial superiority and colonial inferiority. In the twentieth century there have been a few, but notorious, re-uses of the concept, notably by Jensen and Eysenck. It has, however, been almost indisputably shown that biological categorisation of 'races' is impossible and, even if it were, that there is no relation between genetic variation and cultural variation. (1951i; 1985k) So 'race' is not a relevant difference and 'race relations' are really 'social' or 'cultural relations', albeit relations in which a purely ideological ascription of 'race' is one aspect.

But, although 'race' is a figment of ideology, this ideological practice is real and should be termed 'racist'. Racism is an ideology which ascribes casual social significance to phenotypical differences between human groups. For example, in racist ideology Asians contribute to unemployment. The category 'Asian' connotes phenotypical peculiarity, and the statement works as if this was a cause, rather than other structural issues. Racism misconstrues and wrongly explains social process.

Ironically, whilst the more squeamish of well-meaning pluralistic multiculturalists might implicitly admit a reality to 'race' (hence 'race relations'), they often find 'racism' a word with too harsh or condemnatory an edge, or only of use as a moral judgment rather than a useful term of careful analysis. (1985i) Positive multicultural pleasantry is not too ambitious a project, but anti-racism seems to be stirring up a hornet's nest.

'Ethnicity' is a term which raises problems straddling the concepts of 'culture' and 'racism'. In pluralistic multiculturalism, it mostly connotes the same range of meanings as 'culture' characterised above. Three features of its everyday pluralistic use stand out. First, there is a strong emphasis on traditionalism. Second, ethnicity is distinguishable as difference. Third, promotion of ethnicity involves the recognition, appreciation and stage management of differences which are or can be made visible or obvious. In the first two aspects, 'ethnics' are empirically equivalent to 'the wogs' in derogatory idiom. It is mainly non-English speakers or relatively recent immigrants who have national costumes, folk dances or traditional foods which might be described as 'ethnic'. This tends to trivialise differences and lump 'them' with 'ethnicity' together as different from 'us'. In the case of the third aspect, conscious promotion of ethnicity so defined does not disprove

racism. Racism also works at the level of visible difference or obviousness, falsely ascribing this social significance. That this visible difference is cultural rather than phenotypical is not terribly relevant. Indeed, recent forms of racism, such as the apparently more respectable forms that emerged in the recent immigration debate, do not distinguish between phenotypical and cultural obviousness in their superficial and irrational argumentation. Indeed, we would argue that the continuation of a practice of using ethnicity in a simple pluralistic way can create potential grist for the racist mill, despite undoubted good intentions.

This analysis of the conceptual bases of pluralistic multiculturalism might seem, at first glance, far removed from schools and curricula. But, that the above discussion was about terminology and definitions should not obscure the fact that it is really no more than a characterisation of a type of social practice. Indeed, much of the time there are no clearly and consistently elaborated rationales. Semi-conscious rationales come out in the patterns and emphases of practice.

For example, in the socio-cultural area, a frequent practice of pluralistic multiculturalism is still, albeit now somewhat more self-consciously, the 'national day' or 'national festival'. There are no definitions of culture going around the school, but it becomes pretty obvious what culture is meant to be. Much of its content is dress, food and dance, and it is the 'ethnics' who are more able and expected to be more able to find culture suitable for display. For example, in a school in Sydney's inner-west, which for the past few years has viewed itself as a multicultural school in a very public way, problems emerged in the intensive build-ups to national days (replacing the fete). Inter-group rivalry and playground racism increased as difference was accentuated. The small minority of students of English-speaking, longer-established families made self-conscious attempts to make culture for themselves (swaggie hats with corks) but this seemed hardly relevant and many gave up on the enterprise altogether. The hidden message seemed to be that only the ethnics have culture in the sense relevant to multiculturalism. Besides, what was so distinctive about the meat pie stall? ('Australian' culture, ostensibly.) All the kids eat meat pies and many students of second or third generation non-English speaking background didn't have national costumes or other distinctive cultural paraphernalia at home and felt ambivalent about having to make themselves culturally peculiar, against the

grain of their own experience. Finally, a delegation of parents complained bitterly that the chance of making it into a selective high school was slim anyway for the children in this area. Daily folk dancing lessons, they said, were a waste of time. Though participating in the festive events many parents scorned the school for its lack of rigour. In their homeland students were taught to read, write and count. Here, they complained, the teachers didn't know how to do this. This is not to say that the exercise was a total failure (although, after a couple of years, the school has given up on national days and, to a large degree, on multiculturalism). Nor would we wish to imply that obvious cultural differences are to be ignored. It is simply to point out that naively executed pluralistic multiculturalism reduced neither racism nor inequity. As one parent put it, 'singing and dancing, even in your mother tongue, is of little use on the dole queue.'

Though most practitioners would regard this sort of exercise more critically these days, the socio-cultural field still has few examples that go beyond this in terms of rationale. For example, emphases on 'ethnic specific studies' and 'intercultural understanding programs' on the whole still rely on exposure to difference and a belief that an immersion in difference will soften the heart and broaden the mind. This emphasis, coupled with school-based curriculum, makes it difficult to locate projects that can be acclaimed for a more systematic and rigorous approach. The commercial book market is now expanding with superficial glossies on specific ethnic backgrounds and the seeding principle attached to most multicultural funding committees in the socio-cultural area has not assisted the production of materials and programs that are less superficial. Most state policies maintain that multiculturalism is an 'ethos' which should permeate the school. But this rings hollow if no foundation or alternative practices are built into the structure of the school and concrete curriculum materials and practices. A reliance on consultants preaching this line, with little to make their servicing task more practical has produced some disillusionment. A rationale that emphasises difference and multiculturalism simply as an 'ethos' has a very specific and limited scope.

1.2 A Rationale for Socio-Cultural Curriculum Strategies in an Equitable Multiculturalism

Rather than allow culture to define itself by commonsensical connotation, we

need to examine the range of contested meanings of the term. (1980: 24-31) Of these, the clearest, most workable and least open to the difficulties encountered by the pluralistic conception of culture, is the holistic understanding of culture of cultural anthropology. Culture, as a whole way of life, includes not just ethnic-specific differences but, in the very nature of culture, processes that make us all equally and similarly human and aspects of life specific to western industrialism in Australia which we all share, albeit often inequitably. Culture is more than just difference.

To understand the nature of multicultural Australia fully, we need to point to tendencies which lead us in the direction of cultural uniformity as well as those that produce cultural diversity. The modern world has been characterised by, on the one hand, a massive internationalising and universalising trend, produced through the media, transport, labour migration, tourism, industry and trade, the spread of technology, multinational corporations, academic and scientific exchange and so on. This movement is certainly not entirely new to the past few centuries, but is unprecedented in its scale. On the other hand, concomitant with this universalisation, there has been a thrusting together of a huge number of differences between commodities, people and ideas. Previously parochial cultural forms and patterns of socialisation have been brought together to live and work in and for industrialism. Industrialism leaves spaces for their perpetuation in a realm it broadly defines as leisure, spare-time, the family. Indeed, industrialism often celebrates cosmopolitanism; colourful private diversity and public displays and the pastiche of different commodities. This acceptance and placement of positive value on diversity is, ironically, a unique part of the universalist culture of industrialism. (1985a: 87-90)

In this complex and dynamic process, culture operates differently at different levels. This is illustrated by the poignant case of a Lebanese boy, reflecting upon the migration process two years after arrival in Australia. As his teachers, we had experimented with pluralistic multiculturalism, celebrating cultural diversity in the school by featuring the major ethnic groups in social studies. This boy was able to contribute by bringing in artefacts and other visible distinctively Lebanese contributions. Superficially, the exercise was a success. But, on closer examination, focussing on this level of culture alone was having problematic effects in the school. A series of evaluations showed no significant reduction of racism amongst the students of

longer-established English speaking background. There was an increase in cultural chauvinisms centred around the conscious promotion of different cultural identities. But, more importantly, the students' major concerns about multiculturalism displayed a greater interest in other levels of culture we had neglected. (1981: 5-37)

Whilst some students complained that 'it feels like we're being invaded', the Lebanese boy said that his father was unhappy because he 'works like a kid in the factory of the cakes'. This was a level at which there was a profound cultural break in migration to Australia. There was no prospect of continuing Lebanese village life (nor was this necessarily an intention in migrating). The boy himself also felt the cultural break acutely, in a semi-articulate way. When asked to draw where he had lived in Lebanon, he was able to connect all the major social relations of his life pictorially: the village church, the fields, his house, the cemetery, his friends' and relatives' houses. But in his attempts to draw a picture of where he lived in Australia, he found himself frustrated. After three or four attempts at map-like representations (pictures wouldn't work at all), he was unable to draw an integrated diagram of his life in Australia. He couldn't fit all of the key points of his life here into one drawing: his home, church, school and relatives. Even though he did locate school and home, there were large spaces in between, irrelevant to his life.

Western industrial societies can only be conceived and acted upon through historically specific, abstract, socio-linguistic skills. They are large and complex societies in which social relations are not immediately visible nor possibly manipulable (as is a village) through an empirical knowledge of every relevant person and factual detail.

They are worlds represented spatially in complex maps and socially through an understanding of abstract, generalised social relations: banks in relation to social security departments in relation to the police in relation to schools, and so on. This as a cultural peculiarity shared neither by traditional Aboriginal culture nor by the cultures of many immigrants in their place of origin. Whilst a pluralistic multiculturalism simply or primarily busies itself with a celebration of difference, there is another level of cultural singularity in western industrialism that pluralistic multiculturalism conveniently neglects. This level is a site of cultural break (adjusting, for

survival's sake, to a new culture) and relative empowerment or disempowerment. An equitable multiculturalism certainly would celebrate cultural diversity, but would also aim to provide students with tools of social literacy for cultural analysis and mainstream participation. Studying multicultural Australia holistically is certainly a critical aspect of this process.

This requires minimally a renovation of mainstream humanities curricula to incorporate an understanding of the universal socialising process, how difference occurs and how differences interact. This would be prior to, or parallel to an exploration of difference.

We will give a couple of examples from the Social Literacy Project of an alternative approach to the socio-cultural quest of multicultural education. Students in social studies go through a series of content inputs and are placed in experiences that facilitate the building up of conceptual tools for social analysis. The goal is the acquisition of knowledge and the examination of life practices that will inform them of the processes involved in becoming an 'ethnic', a 'female' and so on. The outcome the program aspires to is confident and effective social participation and not the affective goal of simple pluralism of absorbing tolerance by osmosis through exposure to difference.

An input in the primary materials investigates Robinson Crusoe, the great individual who survived on his own by his 'natural' skills. Students discover the fact that Robinson did not survive on that island on his own - that his natural skills involved social products - a gun, a Bible and a language - all products constructed by many others of the culture in which he had been an active member. And such was the effect of his socialisation that when he met Man Friday, he presumed him to have no faith, no language, no skills and proceeded not only to dominate his homeland but to transform him.

The children engaged in the activity as fun. The process is discovery learning, but the experience is structured to ensure examination of the concepts of sociality, the individual, culture as learnt and ethnicity.

At the level of content, the starting point for the materials is a certain unity in the human experience. That is, there is a general need to satisfy basic human needs - material, spiritual and emotional. Difference is explored

as historically and socially constructed. The approach is an holistic one as opposed to a one-sided emphasis on phenomenal difference as represented by 'ethnic studies'.

To take another example, it could be said that Australia is a plural society because you can go to a shop and buy Lebanese bread, white sliced and Swiss bread. The Social Literacy Project approaches that in another way. Lebanese bread is indeed an example of cultural diversity in Australia but only at a certain level because the way that Lebanese bread in plastic bags, sold in shops, is produced and consumed is exactly the same as that for white sliced or Swiss. As well as phenomena of difference, there are cohesive social relations. In everyday life, where Lebanese bread is part of the culture of restaurants and fast food, for example, a level of non plurality is integrally related to a level of plurality.

Finally, the Social Literacy materials stress the acquisition of language skills that empower and make active self-creation possible. Rather than simply aiming to make students in schools with substantial numbers of students of non-English speaking background feel good about being different, they aim to provide all students equally with tools to understand the nature and purpose of culture for all humans, how we each have become variously cultured and gendered people, and how we can actively participate socially and re-make ourselves. (1985f) Along with the philosophical and social goals are goals of pedagogical equity generally. The skills and methods of the various disciplines of study are an integral part of the input's experiences and expectations.

1.3 Pluralistic Rationales for the Language Question

With the rise of multiculturalism in Australia, there have been increasing demands that languages other than English be taught in schools. Whereas all language teaching in the past had been 'foreign' language teaching to formal academic ends, there are now demands that 'community' languages be taught. Multilingualism is an aspect of multiculturalism. Variety of linguistic background should be serviced and supported in a number of social areas, including education.

There is nothing exceptionable about these claims. One can critically distinguish, however, orientations to pluralistic and equitable multiculturalism. Different rationales in teaching languages in schools produce different processes and different outcomes.

The first premise of pluralistic multiculturalism is that all languages spoken in Australia are 'community' languages, including English: equal and valid as forms of communication in the Australian context in the forms in which they are used. Second, languages other than English are to be maintained because it is an intrinsic loss if they are not preserved; because they help maintain communication between generations; because linguistic preservation assists in the preservation of cultural variety; and because this builds self esteem and personal identity. Third, students learning other languages learn culture through language and become more sensitive to other cultures.

There are inherent problems with these rationales, not as elements of a larger language teaching strategy but, as the sole three objectives of 'community' language teaching. First, English is not a 'community' language simply of equal validity in the Australian context. Adequate levels of social participation are only achievable through thorough initiation to certain forms of literacy in English, which include the ability to analyse critically, make abstract generalisations and actively conceptualise and negotiate one's social roles and social relations. As learning and successful participation are eminently social processes, this can only be achieved through the Australian **lingua-franca** which, by historical accident, happens to be English. This is not to imply in any way that languages other than English are unworthy. Unworthiness and intrinsic cultural value are not the point. In these terms English is certainly no 'better' than other languages. To put a moral edge to

a rationale in order to make English just another functionally equivalent 'community' language, however is to obfuscate a practical communicative reality. More seriously, it can become a rationalisation of inequitable socio-linguistic outcomes. We might be tempted to say that 'Standard English' (of the ABC and university essays) for some middle class mono-lingual speakers on the one hand and 'working class migrant English' in tandem with the 'community' language on the other, are equally relevant to each social context. But this would simply be to reproduce a relation of inequity in which one group is statistically much more likely to make it to university to get jobs in the ABC than the other. Such a rationale in language education, rigorously adhered to, could not improve participation for students of non-English speaking background.

Furthermore, not all community languages as they are used in the Australian setting are equal as forms of communication and media of cognition of western industrialism. Parents who were middle class doctors or engineers in their place of origin do not use the same cognitive-linguistic forms as village-dwelling farmers, for example. The former form of language is more apt to reading and using western industrialism in Australia than the latter. This is a technical observation about an accident of history and not a social judgment. For a second generation, this variation is compounded by the extent and form of parental usage of English and the isolation of this language to the realm of domestic interchange. On entry to school and without the formal development of the first language being continued through schooling as it is for native English speakers, it becomes less and less a tool capable of conceptualising the wider social world in a fashion adequate to confident and effective participation. This is in no way to advocate the abandonment of the 'community' language project, but to point out that a rationale which moralistically posits linguistic equality (rather than examining functional efficacy) and simply aims to reproduce community languages as they are used, can simultaneously reproduce socio-linguistic inequity.

'Community' language teaching should do more than this. (1985a: Chapter 5) Language is not an artefact to be preserved for posterity as if it were a museum piece. Rather, it is a social tool, critically assessable for its efficacy, dynamic and open to change or even abandonment if its inheritors so desire. This is not to imply that there is anything necessarily undesirable about maintenance, preservation or linguistic-cultural conservation. (Indeed,

for some Aboriginal languages, this is very important.) But, it is not a moral imperative for all individuals and must be subject to a critical evaluation of social efficacy and social outcomes so that it does not become a rationalisation of inequitability. (1981a: 91-160) Moreover, a presupposition that language **per se** could significantly contribute to intergenerational communication is tendentious to say the least. Real, lived practices, structural possibilities and peer pressures portend inter-generational transformations which language maintenance, even in league with a pluralistic multiculturalism of cultural conservation, cannot reverse. For example, the structural possibility of an independent income and peer and popular cultural pressures (such as to romance) work almost irreversibly against the continuation of arranged marriages. Intergenerational non-communication is often only minimally linguistic and certainly not rectifiable simply linguistically. (1980: 20-24) Finally, having self-esteem or identity as a rationale for language teaching means that it need only be a tokenistic or minimal aspect of the curriculum. As such, it is debatable whether self-esteem is more effectively engendered in success in mainstream school subjects, access to higher education and employment, or through a small statement of respect for the existence of a language in the 'community'.

Third, there is no evidence to suggest that learning another language in itself significantly reduces racism. (1985a: 157) Or at least, it is a relatively inefficient way of tackling the problem compared to more direct and proven anti-racist strategies. Similarly, the propositions about learning culture-through-language are equally unproven, at least at the level of efficiency. Culture-through-language is more an affective pedagogical orientation than a serious study of the way culture works as a basis for generalisable cultural analysis.

1.4 Equitable Rationales for the Language Question.

Language is not simply a cultural artefact that needs preservation, but a tool for self determination and social access. This alternative rationale for language teaching to the pluralistic rationale which we have just critically evaluated, does not constitute a return to the Anglomorphism or assimilationism of teaching towards a 'standard Englisn' of the past, nor a retreat to the teaching of the prestigious 'foreign' languages with

traditional methodologies.

But, on the other hand, it should be evident that there are severe problems in a radical pluralism which works from the populist assumption that speech communities are self-made, self-chosen and that their participants necessarily want them reproduced. Rather, speech communities are not isolated, but in wider social context, are elements in the reproduction of inequity.

Accordingly, a crucial rationale for the teaching of languages other than English should be to extend and even transform socio-linguistic range, aiming for example, for linguistic competence suitable for contexts beyond present domestic usage, to perhaps, higher educational settings in the place of linguistic origin or 'high' literature. Moreover, all language teaching should have an intellectual seriousness and ambitiousness equal to prestigious 'foreign' language teaching. To allow a **de facto** division of 'foreign' from 'community' languages with differentiated goals (e.g. traditional academic/community self-esteem) is to assume different social purposes and different social outcomes. Language learning is of intellectual value in its own right, in terms of an ability to transfer, manipulate and translate symbols and reflect upon the nature of language itself. (1985a: 163-168)

Nor is language an adequate means of preserving culture, even when this might be found to be desirable. Insofar as it is a communicative tool, language is relatively neutral and open to enormous variations in register, semantic range and socio-linguistic function, depending, for example, on socio-economic context. Languages vary and change according to context and the logistics of re-making context. Languages other than English exist in spaces and take on forms limited (such as to the domestic arena) by the structures of industrialism in Australia. (1985a: 116-117) In order to parallel the formal processes of cognitive-linguistic extension that occur for native English speakers through schooling, the teaching of languages other than English needs to extend socio-linguistic usefulness (viewing language as a cognitive-social tool) rather than simply reproduce existing cultural uses.

An equitable approach to teaching English would not only involve a rationale of competence to survival stages or for specific purposes for those new to English usage. It would also involve English for general use and take into account the break that occurs in language development for many Australian born

children of non-English speaking background when they move from home to school. Students of this background often appear to be operating with the same level of proficiency as their English-only peers, particularly in the playground. But if a firm foundation in English has not been established and the first language is not extended, a linguistic void can occur whereby the students have difficulties with the abstract conceptual demands of English in high school studies. The under-representation of non-English speaking background students in selective state high schools and the poor average scores for certificated years in schools of high migrant density attest to a language situation that needs immediate attention if a generation of students is not to be disadvantaged.

2. Processes

2.1 Curriculum Processes in Pluralistic Socio-cultural Education

2.2 Curriculum Processes in an Equitable Socio-cultural Education

2.3 Curriculum Processes in a Pluralistic Approach to the Language Question

2.4 Curriculum Processes in an Equitable Approach to the Language Question

2. Processes

2.1 Curriculum Processes in Pluralistic Socio-cultural Education

The multicultural movement in education has paralleled a movement in the post-war period from traditional to progressivist education. In very broad terms, this movement can be characterised as a relative shift in emphasis from curriculum content to curriculum process; from core, comprehensive curriculum to directly relevant curriculum; from universal moral and intellectual initiation to social and cultural relativism; from centralised, prescriptive curriculum to democratic, diversified curriculum; from passive or rote learning and formal examination of social facts and truths to active inquiry and learning how to make one's own knowledge, relevant to one's own needs. (1985i)

At every point, progressivist education critically defined itself as an improvement upon traditional curriculum. But now we see elements of a return to traditional curriculum, particularly in the United States in the form of the 'Back to Basics' movement, and more recently in the arguments of Australian social critics such as Chipman, Sheridan and Partington and 'popular' calls for greater educational rigour. This new movement defines also itself critically against another movement; in this case against what it perceives to be the drop in 'standards' and the foreclosure of 'opportunities' that came with progressivism. Even though we might disagree with the analyses and prescriptions, many of the arguments of this critical return need to be addressed seriously. This is particularly the case for the socio-cultural aspect of multicultural education which took its pluralistic shape in the context of progressivist education.

With the movement from curriculum content to curriculum process, textbooks about loyalties to Queen and British Commonwealth and arguing for the cultural assimilation of Aborigines and immigrants in Australia were thrown out. Instead, there was to be an emphasis on open curriculum processes, school-based curriculum and the creation of curriculum relevant to school and community situations. In other words, there was no longer a core of knowledge or the possibility of comprehensive curriculum for all schools, but, reflecting the realities of cultural plurality, various locally and culturally relevant curricula. Accordingly schools were not to initiate students to a

cultural and moral monolith, but to acknowledge the validity of and actively support cultural relativism. So, centralised prescription of cultural content was inappropriate. Instead, curriculum would be democratic. This necessitated curriculum diversification to meet various cultural needs and desires. As there were no longer fixed universal social truths, students were to engage in a process of active inquiry into their own community situations.

There was a considerable degree of pedagogical validity to the progressivist claim to be substantially improving upon traditional curriculum. Students do, indeed, learn better through active inquiry and in curricula that they perceive to be directly relevant to their own lives. However, a number of serious problems arise with progressivist education which militate against equitability and educational effectiveness. We will illustrate this with examples from pluralistic multicultural practice.

In the policies of the Commonwealth Schools Commission in its first decade, we see a movement from a conception that disadvantage can be worked against by strategies of initiation to 'core culture', to pluralistic multiculturalism. (1984a) Whilst the concept of initiation might have been unfortunate, with possible connotations of Anglomorphism, the movement to pluralistic multiculturalism can easily involve an abandonment of the project of broadening access and social participation. Cultural relativism has an air of moral egalitarianism, but neglects the sociological fact that simply reproducing communities and cultures as they are is often simultaneously to reproduce relations of inequity. To be more specific, core, comprehensive, curriculum (such as the traditional academic curriculum) might simply have defined as failures certain groups of students. But directly relevant, diversified curriculum might do the same thing, without even the accountability of a general credential. So, for example, in the name of democratic diversification we find some schools with some cultural groupings in some socio-economic settings maintaining the traditional academic curriculum (relevant to educational and occupational success) whilst other schools in a very different context opt for a multiculturalism of international cooking, 'communication skills' (rather than English), and leisure skills for constructive unemployment. Multiculturalism hardly even appears to be an issue for schools of the former variety, whereas it seems to be relevant and eminently a 'need' in lieu of the failing traditional academic curriculum for schools in the latter category. So, this apparent

democratisation in the interests of cultural pluralism, relevance and needs, in fact serves more to pre-destine social outcome than to open possibilities of participation.

Parents of children of non-English background on the whole are very clear about wanting a future for their children which is not just a reproduction of their own lives and occupations - academic success is therefore very important. (1985a) The centrality of English and formal credentialing cannot therefore be sidestepped by engaging in processes that ask this in the name of difference. Rationales of 'needs' and 'relevance' still have to take into account the expectations and aspirations of students and their parents, if these terms are not to be an irony or an imposition of a particular sort of need or relevance deemed realistic by teachers and consultants.

Further, the move from an emphasis on curriculum content to an emphasis on curriculum process has produced serious logistical problems for teachers. Whilst traditional curricula and traditional teaching practices might have amounted to poor pedagogy, teachers had clear and relatively undemanding bases for teaching, in the form of syllabuses listing sequential content and textbooks that backed them up. Progressivist curriculum handed down to teachers a series of grand and inspiring pedagogical dicta, but little else. The pressure on teachers to produce their own curricula without substantial release or inservice time is enormous. The difficulties and relative inefficiencies are the result of the practical limits on the ability of teachers to produce curricula that meet the ideals of the new guidelines and often mean the re-invention of the wheel from school to school.

The process emphasis also leads to educational strategies that rely heavily on funding arrangements based on seeding principles, consultants and ethnic aides. Whilst all those are important, they are never sufficient in practice to close the gap between materials production and sustained whole school development programs.

Multiculturalism, compounding these difficulties, does not leave curriculum content entirely open. Racism in one form or another might seem relevant for some students, for example. Multicultural policies prescribe specific social content for curriculum. But, in conjunction with directives to school-based curriculum development, these are often received as abstract moral imperatives

by teachers. This is a particular problem for a contentious, new and subtle area of social policy, in which many of the key terms are unclear or disputed even for many of the specialists in the field.

This dilemma tends to produce, in the socio-cultural area, three possible practical problems in schools. First, as it is hard enough already to keep one's head above water in producing curriculum, it is tempting to avoid such a difficult and sensitive area of social inquiry. In the curriculum context, multiculturalism is often harder to do than no multiculturalism. Second, it is easier to piece together collages of visible cultural difference (films, artefacts, community observations) than to undertake a systematic inquiry of what culture is for all of us, how it works, how cultures differ and what racism involves. Multiculturalism in social education can become a soft option, with less of the intellectual rigour and academic prestige of the longer-established disciplines. These areas are less affected by the progressivist transformation of education because they have traditions, 'standards' and 'textbooks' to fall back upon. Third, socio-cultural study in this form attempts to tackle racism as if it was a simple matter of individual moral lapse, and assumes that tolerance will be produced by osmosis through immersion in sensations of difference. This can often take on a moralising tone, preaching niceness rather than approaching culture and racism analytically and rationally. The jump from difference to tolerance has to be an act of good faith. However, immersion in visible difference might only confirm stereotypical preconceptions that are also the basis for racism. Given these problems, the current shift to the principle of mainstreaming and the notion of multiculturalism as a 'perspective' could signal the end of the transforming task for some educators before it has had any effect.

2.2 Curriculum Processes in an Equitable Socio-cultural Education

Multicultural curriculum is a concern for all schools and all students equally. Social education focusing on the nature of culture, the realities of cultural plurality in Australia and racism, should be an exercise of (at least) equal intellectual validity, profundity and relevance to social literacy and social participation, as any traditional discipline area. Multiculturalism is a concern that should pervade mainstream curriculum areas. To achieve these ends, we need to join together the best of traditional and

progressivist curriculum without viewing the virtues of each as polar opposites.

For example, especially in the implementation of new areas of social policy in schools, we need to exemplify curriculum processes with tried and tested curriculum content. The processes of inquiry learning and students' analysing their own cultural values and practices need to be exemplified in substantial curriculum materials which make life easier rather than harder for the teacher. There is a very big difference between, on the one hand, generally usable curriculum materials that suggest strategies and sequences for students to analyse their own becoming as cultured beings, what they share with others and how they differ, and on the other hand, the dogmatic cultural impositions of traditional textbooks. Insofar as there is a general social content to some of the core aspects of multiculturalism - non-racism and multiculturalism as social values - there is no need for schools to have to re-invent the wheel. A number of exemplary programs of social education materials need to be developed and disseminated so that multiculturalism arrives in schools not as a burden, a threat or an implied accusation of past failure, but as a positive help.

Truly relevant core curriculum need not preclude local community relevance or community involvement. And teaching to certain fundamental, universal or socially agreed ends need not mean lack of respect for cultural plurality. Inquiry methodology applied to socio-cultural studies can also involve the development of general cognitive-conceptual-linguistic skills for active and confident social participation: skills of analysis (conceptualisation, generalisation, interpretation, inference, and so on), criticism (hypothesising, critical reflection, responsible choice and decision making) and creation (active participation, formal skills for social access and empowerment). Inquiry learning and multiculturalism need not become a mish-mash of films, excursions and colouring-in sessions.

In this endeavour, racism needs to be tackled head on. Curriculum strategies to this end need to be thoroughly trialled and widely disseminated. This needs to be done in a systematic and co-ordinated way, and not left to hit and miss from school to school. Racism is not easily combatted and well intentioned strategies backfire as often as not. In particular, indirect, affective strategies seem to be less effective than direct, rationalistic approaches to

the problem, albeit ones executed slowly, carefully and with subtlety. (1984d; 1985f)

This strategy would require targetted program funding to redesign mainstream curriculum areas and linked strategies for professional development. Decentralised, systems-supported centres of curriculum development involving a concerted effort between the community, teachers, consultants, policy makers and academics would help to bridge the current gap between school based and commercial material. Teacher training and inservice programs need to prepare and equip teachers to move beyond superficial, one-off responses to the reality of cultural plurality and involve them in an understanding of critical breaks as well as continuities. In conjunction with this, evaluation procedures need to be developed to assess pedagogical outcomes of the strategies employed.

2.3 Curriculum Processes in a Pluralistic Approach to the Language Question

A very predictable pattern of servicing flows from the rationales for a pluralistic approach to the language question. Or, perhaps it is more accurate to say that limitedness of rationale is related to the practical possibilities of servicing.

Without a sustained program of teaching languages other than English throughout schooling and to the standard traditionally expected in 'foreign' language teaching in the secondary school, it is difficult to go beyond the limitations of pluralistic multiculturalism.

In the everyday school processes of teaching 'community' languages, problems arise about which languages are to be taught and their scope and pedagogy. Consistent with the pluralistic rationales of self-esteem, cultural maintenance and intergenerational communication, all students of non-English speaking backgrounds would need to be taught their parents' 'community' language in a sustained way. As acknowledged in the National Language Policy, this is impossible. In 1983 for example, only 1.6 percent of students in N.S.W. primary schools were learning languages other than English, of whom 55 percent were native speakers.

The Cahill Review of the Commonwealth Multicultural Education Program noted a naivete in 'community' language teaching about levels attainable in one hour's teaching per week and about home language proficiency. It found little evidence that teachers wanted to go beyond language sensitisation courses. Even in those instances where 'community' languages are available, there are few cases of going beyond the limited and problematic rationales of simple pluralism towards an equitable and more educationally effective multiculturalism. (1984g; 1985a: Chapter 7)

Indeed, the very pedagogical content of 'community' languages, with an emphasis on direct (e.g. domestic) relevance and communicative 'real life' situations is a consequence in process of pluralistic rationales. This is reflected in the secondary school in a practical distinction and frequent variation in status between 'community' and traditional 'foreign' languages with each tending to align themselves with different streams in the 'diversified' curriculum. In N.S.W. secondary schools, 74.6 percent of language students still take French and German. (1984g; 1985a: Chapter 7)

One Sydney school, to cite an example of the above processes in action, began a community language program which, whilst consistent with pluralistic rationales, arguably achieved little in terms of equitability. A primary school with a significant proportion of students of Italian language background, it introduced a one hour per week Italian community language program for all students, at two year levels. For the students of Italian language background, such a limited program could hardly continue lines of linguistic-cognitive development disrupted on entry to school (relative to their English language background peers). Nor was it able to extend even domestic usages in any significant way, particularly as levels of domestic competence were extremely varied and not easily assessed in the formal school context. Not only was the program for two isolated years, but it was dropped when the supplementary funding ceased. All in all, the exercise proved to be no more than a token to esteem of identity rather than a process which could in any significant way improve educational equitability. For the students of English speaking background, the outcome was knowledge of a few key words of Italian 'culture', mostly culinary. None of the cognitive benefits of systematic and sustained language learning could accrue to these students. Moreover, it is debatable whether even the limited objectives of 'cultural sensitisation' of pluralistic rationales for language teaching were met, given

the trivialised and superficial picture of culture that emerged.

This sort of experience is not to damn the whole of the 'community' language project, even in its pluralistic forms. Often, in limited and difficult circumstances, useful pedagogies and materials have emerged. The space made for such initiatives is crucial and allows for development into more serious, substantial and sustained educational endeavours. But at other times, resources have, as it turns out, simply been wasted. These resources could have been more profitably used in English as a second language teaching, for example.

Another serious dilemma is the criteria for choosing another language to include in a school's offering. The size of a language population which is the commonest method used, clearly is inadequate within the terms of a pluralist rationale as it disadvantages smaller language populations.

2.4 Curriculum Processes in an Equitable Approach to the Language Question

Curriculum process in language teaching should be based on the premise that linguistic life histories are not simply to be celebrated and reproduced. An equitable approach to the language question should be interventionary.

In the teaching of English, curriculum should not be diversified on the presupposition that different students are inevitably destined to different educational and social outcomes, as practically occurs in the distinction of traditional academic English teaching from 'Communication Skills' (how to fill out Social Security forms or apply for a job). This is neither to advocate a return to the traditional academic curriculum nor the universal teaching of 'standard' English. But there are some communicative-cognitive forms essential to effective and genuinely open social participation. This doesn't necessarily have to involve middle class accent, style or the high culture of traditionally empowering usages of English, but certain more fundamental tools of socio-linguistic access that the traditional academic curriculum differentially dispensed to some groups but not others.

To achieve these fundamentally common educational ends, different pedagogies will need to be employed. English as a Second Language teaching is an

excellent example of this. Its ultimate end should be, in basic linguistic-cognitive terms, no less than any other English teaching. ESL is a specialist servicing to cater to real plurality and to intervene in order to make education more equitable.

For effective teaching of native languages other than English and the non-interruption of lines of cognitive-linguistic and social development, various forms of maintenance or transitional bilingualism need to be experimented with. Furthermore, all languages other than English should be taught to a standard and degree of intellectual seriousness equivalent to that traditionally expected in foreign language teaching. And the ultimate goal of such teaching should not necessarily be 'community' forms of the language, but 'standard' forms not defined traditionally or by status but by linguistic-cognitive generality. In this context, different 'community' genres and usages can be analysed and adapted. None of this necessarily means traditionalism in terms of pedagogy. Differential servicing is necessary to achieve these ends, depending on the forms of language used by the students, but the end of the process need not simply be to reproduce these forms.

In practical terms, the following measures are also required in the move to a more equitable approach to teaching languages other than English; the development of evaluative devices to assess the nature and form of first language usage; pedagogical processes which introduce students to a variety of genres and forms of the language; the availability of languages other than English to all students for the intellectual reasons conventionally ascribed to 'foreign' language teaching, and thus, for practical reasons, not necessarily one's native language; careful evaluation of educational outcomes; parallel socio-cultural programs that assist students to investigate, amongst other things, the nature of language in culture and society, racism and inter-generational cultural maintenance or conflict. For efficiency and effectiveness' sake, this last quest cannot be an isolated objective of language teaching or even one that language teaching itself can achieve.

Given the centrality of English in Australia and the large number of students needing specialist programs, some serious attention needs to be given to developing models which link and exemplify different methodologies and content. To date English as a second language has had marginal status in terms of research, training and professional accreditation and reward. With the

paucity of research and materials development in this area, the mainstreaming movement again could further inadvertently reduce the impact of positive movements already underway. Curriculum development in English as a foreign language would also be enhanced by a co-ordinated cross-fertilisation of other than English curriculum programs, particularly with regard to the process of language acquisition in general. The debate between traditional and more recent variants of communicative methodologies has yet to be resolved in a fruitful way.

3. Outcomes

3.1 Outcomes of a Pluralistic Approach to Socio-cultural Studies

3.2 Outcomes of an Approach to Socio-cultural Studies Oriented to Equity

3.3 Outcomes of a Pluralistic Approach to the Language Question

3.4 Outcomes of an Equitable Approach to the Language Question

3. Outcomes

3.1 Outcomes of a Pluralistic Approach to Socio-cultural Studies

The consequences, in sum, in terms of educational outcome, of pluralistic rationales (section 1.1) and curriculum processes (section 2.1) for multicultural education, can include a trivialised, stereotypical concept of culture; a view of culture and ethnicity equated with traditionalism and non-English speaking background; an institutional and intellectual marginalisation of the issues of multiculturalism; a hidden agenda of assimilation (because the necessities of social participation are not discussed and the difficulties avoided by means of the happy partial fiction of pluralism); exacerbation of racism through an excessive emphasis on visible difference; condoning or even promoting ethnic chauvinisms; emotional appeals to the heart rather than rational argumentation addressed to the intellect about the nature of culture and racism; and a patronising cultural relativism.

This is not to condemn any element of the multicultural project out of hand, but to point to worrysome tendencies when the emphasis is simply pluralistic; tendencies often directly contrary to the intentions of those involved. Already there is much disillusionment with the multicultural project. People working conscientiously within the framework often find it difficult to sustain wider support except as an article of faith. Teachers and schools which are poorly supported and il-prepared by their training and their own socialisation to respond to the servicing demands produced by the realities of plurality, are relieved to be able to ignore it. Often it is thought that, as time goes on, it will become easier because the hidden assimilating forces of everyday life will make their mark. In the meantime celebrations of difference and the affirmation of the idea of 'a fair go' seem sufficient. The main deficiences in the pluralistic approach can be summed up in terms of rationales that inadvertently allow difference to impede choice and displace skills. An emphasis on processes, seeding, a consultancy vanguard and ethnic-specific approaches can lead to outcomes that do not posit equity as a goal of the compulsory education phase of schooling, and in fact problematically contribute to an understanding of the process of belonging in a society like Australia with people from a variety of different backgrounds.

3.2 Outcomes of an Approach to Socio-cultural Studies Oriented to Equity

Cultural diversity is not just a matter of happy plurality. It brings with it often a clash of interests and life projects as testified by the range of historic and social interactions from Aboriginal to migrant and refugee experiences. Both at the socio-cultural and language levels there are real educational servicing requirements. Curriculum is central but, of course, not alone. Curriculum cannot be discussed without attention to its location in the education structure: funding and pedagogical policies, delivery procedures, (training, professional development and support generally), and reception procedures (whole schooling programming, communities, presentation, outcomes and achievements).

The socio-cultural area of multicultural education could and needs to be more than a moral quest to improve 'attitudes', 'self-esteem', 'tolerance', 'respect', 'understanding', and 'cultural sensitivity'. It should also involve gaining an understanding of the nature of culture; what we all share as humans; how and why cultures differ; and racism as an inadequate practical and interpretative framework of cultural interaction.

Such an educational process should be valid for all students and ultimately of intellectual seriousness equal to any discipline area. Fundamentally, socio-cultural study should aim at forms of abstraction culturally specific and necessary to effective participation in western industrialism; analysis (conceptualisation, generalisation, etc.: industrial societies can only be conceived abstractly through a process of naming social categories and comprehending general relationships between groups); critical evaluation (interpretation, confident assessment, hypothesising, etc.); and social creativity (active communication, negotiation, etc.).

Nor should multiculturalism in its socio-cultural guise become a soft academic option. In social education, it needs to incorporate the formal skills of the traditional social science areas; mapping skills, skills of evaluating historical documents, and so on. And it has a particular role in relation to language across the curriculum and the development of social literacy. This is not to say that it has to be narrowly academic. It can be open to local relevance and community inquiry, it can be fun and it can involve active

learning. One doesn't have to use traditional pedagogies to be able to achieve what the traditional academic curriculum selectively imparted to a privileged few.

Moreover, multiculturalism, for all schools, is not just a matter of cultural difference and curriculum diversity. It includes a number of core social values and real social issues to be faced by all Australians. As such, schools should not be left to re-invent the wheel, particularly in a subtle and new area of social policy.

Ultimately, such a multiculturalism would not achieve thoughtless cultural conservation or rebellious dropping-out, but critical cultural choice. Differences should not impede choice and self determination. Whilst an assimilationist would celebrate inter-generational change towards 'Australian' norms and an avid pluralist would try valiantly to maintain culture from generation to generation, a more helpful multiculturalism would go to neither extreme. It would assist students in finding explanations for generational difference, help them understand the origins and nature of parental expectations and the processes of their own becoming; and provide a more sound basis for genuine understanding and mature choice than simple advocacy of assimilation or conservation. (1980)

3.3 Outcomes of a Pluralistic Approach to the Language Question

Linguistic life histories and the unqualified reproduction of speech communities do not portend equitable outcomes. This applies both to variant forms of English and languages other than English.

Given differing rationales for 'community' and 'foreign' language teaching, a problematic division in status, pedagogy and likely educational outcomes, remains.

The logistical problems of providing language teaching to all students of non-English speaking background, consistent with the rationales of pluralistic multiculturalism, ultimately throws much of the educational onus for formal language learning back onto self-help and the 'communities' themselves. The issues are thus marginalised educationally.

3.4 Outcomes of an Equitable Approach to the Language Question

Whilst variant pedagogies and specialist educational techniques are necessary to service adequately the linguistic plurality that exists in Australia, the aim of all language learning should be towards forms of language that provide broadest and most potent cognitive and communicative usefulness together with initiation to a range of linguistic genres, idioms and types of discourse.

Given the logistical impossibility of meeting pluralistic rationales about servicing of native languages, the educational benefits of learning any other language in a systematic and sustained way should be open to all students throughout schooling. For certain categories of students, transitional or maintenance bilingual programs might also be important to prevent disruption of lines of cognitive development on entry to school.

Bibliography

The text of the above position paper refers to the following publications of Kalantzis and Cope. In these are to be found more elaborated arguments, references to the literature in the field and the results of empirical research and practical work.

(1980) 'Multicultural Education and the Meaning of "Culture".' Social Literacy Monograph 1, 1980. Revised version, forthcoming in Centre for Multicultural Studies, University of Wollongong, occasional monograph series, 1985.

(1981) **Just Spaghetti and Polka? Introduction to Australian Multicultural Education**, Social Literacy, Sydney, 1981, 144pp.

(1982) 'From Lebanese Bread to White Sliced', **The Australian Teacher**, September 1982. Reprinted in **Multicultural Education** (published by Multicultural Education Council of the Alberta Teachers' Association, Edmonton, Canada), April 1983.

(1983a) 'Shaping the Curriculum: Some Unanswered Questions', **Curriculum Perspectives**, Vol 3, No 3, October 1983. Reprinted in **Curriculum Exchange**, Vol 2, No 1, 1984. (Jointly with Chris Hughes)

(1984a) 'Multicultural Education and the Schools Commission: Social Experimentation and School Reform', Social Literacy Monograph 2, 1984. Forthcoming in Johnson, K. (ed.), **Education since the Karmel Report**, 1985.

(1984b) 'Multiculturalism and Education Policy,' in Bottomley G. (ed.), **Class, Gender and Ethnicity**, George, Allen and Unwin, 1984, pp82-97.

(1984c) 'Curriculum Developments in the United States', **Newsletter**, Social Education of Australia, No 6, May 1984.

(1984d) 'Head or Heart? Strategies for Combatting Racism', position paper for Channel 0/28. Social Literacy Monograph 9, 1984. Reprinted in **Curriculum Exchange**, Vol 2 No 2, 1984, pp54-71.

(1984e) 'Making Curriculum in Australia', in Simkin, D. (ed.), **Curriculum Development in Action**, Tressell Publications, Brighton, England, 1984 pp159-178. Reprinted in **Curriculum Exchange**, Vol 3 No 1, 1985, pp90-107. (Jointly with Chris Hughes)

(1984f) 'Some Comments on Curriculum Developments in N.S.W.', Social Literacy Monograph 8, 1984.

(1984g) 'A Response to the Cahill **et al.** Review of the Multicultural Education Program', December, 1984. Social Literacy Monograph 10, forthcoming.

(1985a) **The Language Question.** A report for the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs on the Maintenance of Languages other than English, based on a Survey of German and Macedonian Language Maintenance in the Wollongong - Shellharbour Region, forthcoming, Australian Government Publishing Service, 1985. (504pp) (Jointly with Diana Slade)

(1985b) **The Relationship Between First Language Illiteracy and Second Language Acquisition,** Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. Forthcoming, 1985. (Jointly with Robyn Gurney)

(1985c) **The Learning Process,** Adult Migrant Education Program Review. (185pp) July, 1985. (Jointly with Caroline Alcorso.)

(1985d) 'Pluralism and Social Reform: A Review of Multiculturalism in Australian Education', **Thesis Eleven,** No 10/11, 1985, pp195-215. (Jointly with Chris Hughes)

(1985e) 'Community Languages: Politics or Pedagogy?', **Australian Review of Applied Linguistics,** Vol 8 No 3, 1985.

(1985f) 'The Cultural Deconstruction of Racism', paper for the Cultural Construction of Race Conference, Sydney University, 2-4 August 1985. Social Literacy Monograph 11, forthcoming.

(1985g) 'Culture and Merit', paper for 'Defining Merit' Conference, Macquarie University, 27 September, 1985. (Jointly with Maria Issaris) Social Literacy Monograph 12, forthcoming.

(1985h) **Making Futures for Young People.** A study of youth culture and employment, Common Ground, Sydney, 1985. 57pp. (Jointly with Greg Noble **et al.**)

(1985i) 'The Reality of a Term: "Racism" in Social Analysis', **Australian Society,** July 1985, pp25-27.

(1985j) 'The Social Literacy Project: A Curriculum Experiment', paper for the Curriculum '85 Conference, La Trobe University, 23-26 August 1985. Social Literacy Monograph 14, forthcoming.

(1985k) 'Racism and Naturalness', paper for the Cultural Construction of Race Conference, Sydney University, 2-4 August 1985. Social Literacy Monograph 15, forthcoming.

(1985l) 'Traditional and Progressivist Education', paper for the Curriculum '85 Conference, La Trobe University, 23-26 August 1985. Social Literacy Monograph 13, forthcoming.

(1986) A National Review of Inservice Programs for Teachers of Adolescents of Non-English Speaking Background for the Commonwealth Department of Education. Forthcoming, 1986. Jointly with Ted Booth.